

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed January 9, 2008, the Examiner noted that claims 2-8, 10-15 and 17-22 are pending, and rejected all claims. Claims 7, 15 and 22 have been amended, new claims 23 and 24 have been added and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 2-8, 10-15 and 17-24 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejection is traversed below.

Page 4 of the Office Action rejects claims 2-8, 10-15 and 17-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Matsubara.

Matsubara discusses an appliance recycling system having a client, an intermediary server and multiple recycling type servers. Each of the recycling servers corresponds to a type of recycling. For example, server 120 is associated with a second hand shop and server 170 is associated with waste disposal. The user receives a display from the intermediary server and, as the Examiner acknowledges, "can select an appliance disposal business concern or a way or manner of disposing of the appliance. It is assumed that once the disposal business concern is determined, the way of disposal is automatically determined correspondingly, and vice versa." (see Matsubara, paragraph 31). That is, the user selects a way or a business and the Examiner asserts that this is effectively selecting a location.

Suzuki discusses recycling factories that include a specific article maker recycler, a unspecified article manufacturer recycler and an article category or type recycler (see Suzuki, col. 31, line 60+).

In contrast, to Matsubara and Suzuki, claim 1 emphasizes that a recycling plant is selected based on whether a restriction standard is exceeded where the standard relates to the physical characteristics of the equipment. (See application page 4) Matsubara and Suzuki do not teach or suggest the use of equipment physical characteristics to determine a recycling plant.

Claims 15 and 22 also emphasize that physical characteristics are used to determine a recycling plant.

It is submitted that the independent claims distinguish over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

New claim 23 emphasizes that the physical characteristics that are used to determine the plant are weight and/or size. Matsubara or Suzuki do not teach the use of physical characteristics much less weight and/or size. New claim 24 emphasizes a comparison to a

physical characteristic limitation to designate a recycling plant. Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests such. It is submitted that these new claims, which are different and not narrower than prior filed claims, distinguish over the prior art.

It is submitted that the are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 8, 2008

By: /J. Randall Beckers/  
J. Randall Beckers  
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501